

Attachment to Independent Case Review Report
For CDRU # 860 Case file # 95-290381.

Material Examiner: Malone (RO)

Remarks:

Case resulted in trial, transcript available.

Was any other material reviewed? Yes No

If yes, please identify and/or describe the material: Submitting agency letter (dated 9-19-89)

Results of Review

File #: 95-290381 Item or Specimen # Reviewed: Q1-Q8, Q13-Q17, K1, K2, K4, K5

Review of Laboratory Report(s) and Bench Notes:

Note: Numbered comments are required below or on additional pages for any "No" or "Unable to Determine" Responses

- 1) Did the examiner perform the appropriate tests in a scientifically acceptable manner, based on the methods, protocols, and analytic techniques available at the time of the original examination(s)?
 Yes No Unable to Determine
- 2) Are the examination results set forth in the laboratory report(s) supported and adequately documented in the bench notes?
 Yes No Unable to Determine

Review of Testimony:

Note: Numbered comments are required below or on additional pages for any "No" or "Unable to Determine" Responses

- Transcript not available.
- 3) Testimony consistent with the laboratory report(s)? Yes No Unable to Determine
 - 4) Testimony consistent with the bench notes? Yes No Unable to Determine
 - 5) Testimony within bounds of examiner's expertise? Yes No Unable to Determine

Page 2 of 4

Initials: SMA

Comments

(Set forth by above question #, if applicable.
Use "Additional Comments" Sheet, if needed)

File #: 95-290381

#1: With microscopic hair examination, even with the best notes, there is no way to determine the examination was performed correctly.

#2: The examination results set forth in the laboratory report are supported by the bench notes, but the documentation is marginally adequate. The notes are not dated or initialed and are in pencil. The bench notes do not document why the Negroid hair recovered from Q5 (victim's jumpsuit) is not suitable for comparison. The notes conclude items Q4 and Q5 are torn, but there is no documentation of the observed characteristics leading to that conclusion.

#3: Malone testified that "I processed all the items for hair and fibers" and "I removed all the hairs from these

Review completed at: 4:00 PM (Time), 03/13/2001 (Date)

Total time spent conducting review (to nearest 1/4 hour): 0:45 hours

I hereby certify that I conducted this review in an independent, unbiased manner and that the results of my review are fully documented on this report consisting of a total of 4 pages.

Steve Roberts
(Signature)

03/13/2001

(Date)

Page 3 of 4

Initials: *SR*

Additional Comments
(Set forth by question #, if applicable)

File #: 95-290381

#3 (continued): items". The notes indicate, and this reviewer has been told, that technicians process and recover the hair and fiber evidence and that Malone didn't do technician work.

Malone testified twice that the hair recovered from the quilt and the jumpsuit are Negroid hair "fragments". His laboratory report does not state that the hair are fragments. (see #4 below)

#4: Malone's hench notes do not indicate the Negroid hair recovered from Q5 and Q6 are fragments. His notes are not consistent with his testimony concerning this.

Initials: SM